

## **REMARKS**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for review of the present application.

The Office Action of May 8, 2008, rejects all of Claims 1, 3-5, 7-25, 27, and 29-41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Claims 1, 3-5, 7-15, 17-25, 27, 29, 32-34, and 37-39 are rejected as unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0033296 to Rothmuller et al. ("the Rothmuller publication") in view of U.S. Patent 6,515,687 to Wynn et al. ("the Wynn patent") and U.S. Patent 6,337,697 to Becker et al. ("the Becker patent"). Claim 16 is rejected as unpatentable over the Rothmuller patent in view of the Wynn patent and the Becker patent and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,512,530 to Rzepkowski et al. ("the Rzepkowski patent"). And Claims 30, 31, 35, 36, 40, and 41 are rejected as unpatentable over the Rothmuller patent in view of the Wynn patent and the Becker patent and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,677,965 to Ullmann et al. ("the Ullmann patent"). The Office Action also objects to the Drawings as failing to include reference character 322 found in the Specification at page 15, line 6 (paragraph 0051).

Applicant has amended numerous claims in view of the interview, and presents the following remarks in response to the rejections of the Office Action. Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections of the Office Action are overcome and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance for at least the following reasons.

### OBJECTION TO DRAWINGS

The Office Action objected to the Drawings as failing to include reference character 322 found in the specification at page 15, line 6 (paragraph 0051). Applicant has amended the Specification to correct the reference character 322 to recite reference character 420, as illustrated in FIGS. 1 and 4 and described in the specification (see paragraphs 0059 and 0061) as the center mark. Applicant submits this amendment to the Specification overcomes the objection to the Drawings.

### REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action rejects Claims 1, 3-5, 7-15, 17-25, 27, 29, 32-34, and 37-39 as unpatentable over the Rothmuller publication in view of the Wynn patent and the Becker patent. At page 4, the Office Action states "Rothmuller teaches second instructions adapted to generate a media handle..." and "disclosing a slider that is movable to different dates to display pictures from those dates and using the timeline with tags...", citing to paragraphs 28-31 and FIG. 3. Applicant has reviewed the cited portions and the remainder of the Rothmuller publication and respectfully disagrees, specifically and expressly submitting that the Rothmuller patent does not teach or suggest a media handle as claimed. In this regard, Applicant notes that the Rothmuller publication only discloses a "timeline 250" with what appear to be separate left and right scroll buttons at the lower left and right corners of timeline 250, as might be used to move the time bands

251 left and right along the timeline 250. However, nothing is disclosed in relation to the timeline 250 or the time bands 251 that teaches or suggests a “media handle” as claimed. Applicant specifically submits that the Rothmuller publication provides no disclosure of “a slider” as stated in the Office Action. Nothing in the Rothmuller publication teaches or suggests any ability to move the timeline 250, other than the depicted, but non-described, left and right scroll buttons in FIGS. 1 and 3. If the Examiner disagrees, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner provide a specific reference and explanation regarding what is believed in the Rothmuller publication to disclose “a slider”.

However, to further prosecution of the present application and more clearly recite the claimed subject matter, Applicant has also amended independent Claims 1, 22, and 24. Applicant has amended the claims to recite that the “a timeline view comprising a scrolling time bar and a media handle.” Applicant finds support for the present amendment from the drawings and description of the present application as originally filed. See, e.g., “timeline view 300”, “time bar 310”, and “media handle/speed browser 320”. As described above, the Rothmuller publication only discloses a timeline 250 with time bars 251. There is no media handle disclosed by the Rothmuller publication.

Further, Applicant has amended independent Claims 1, 22, and 24 to recite that that a deviated position of the media handle is relative to a centerline position of *the scrolling time bar*. Applicant finds no support in the Wynn patent related to a media handle being deviated from a centerline position of a scrolling time bar. Rather, the Wynn patent merely discloses a normal, center position of *the virtual joystick control*, not of a scrolling time bar. The virtual joystick control of the Wynn patent has no association to a centerline position of a scrolling time bar.

Further, Applicant submits that the Becker patent fails to remedy the lack of disclosure of either the Rothmuller publication or the Wynn patent. The Becker patent merely discloses a conventional scroll bar 64 with scroll buttons 66 and 69 and a slider 62, like the prior art of FIG. 2 of the Wynn patent. But nothing in the Becker patent teaches or suggests a timeline view comprising a scrolling time bar and *a media handle*. And nothing in the Becker patent teaches or suggests that a deviated position of a media handle is relative to a centerline position of *a scrolling time bar*.

Further, with respect to Claim 7, Applicant submits that nothing in any of the Rothmuller publication, the Wynn patent, or the Becker patent discloses “decreasing the speed of the browsing in relation to the distance of the *approaching media file*.” Applicant notes that the Wynn patent only discloses, as stated on page 7 of the Office Action, “dynamically varying scroll speed in response to the content of the viewed portion of the viewable object.” I.e., the Wynn patent only discloses activity in response to an actual currently viewable portion of an object. The Wynn patent fails to teach or suggest decreasing the speed of browsing in relation to an approaching media file. The Wynn patent also fails to teach or suggest that

decreasing the speed of browsing in relation to an approaching media file should also be performed in relation to the distance of the approaching media file from a media view. Applicant submits that Claim 7 is patentable for this additional reason.

Further, with respect to Claim 8 and like dependent Claims 32 and 37, Applicant submits that nothing in any of the Rothmuller publication, the Wynn patent, or the Becker patent discloses "increasing the speed of the browsing when a media file having the chosen browse parameter *bypasses the centerline position of a view*." Applicant notes that the Wynn patent only discloses, as stated on page 7 of the Office Action "dynamically varying scroll speed in response to the content of the viewed portion of the viewable object." I.e., the Wynn patent only discloses activity in response to an actual currently viewable portion of an object. The Wynn patent fails to teach or suggest that increasing the speed of browsing should also be performed in relation to a media file bypassing a centerline of a media view. Applicant submits that Claim 8, further dependent Claim 9, and similar dependent Claims 32 and 37 are patentable for this additional reason.

Further with respect to Claim 16 that is rejected as unpatentable over the Rothmuller patent in view of the Wynn patent and the Becker patent and further in view of the Rzepkowski patent. At page 11, the Office Action states "Rzepkowski teaches a numerical portion that includes a value display portion and a pair of buttons that are used to increase or decrease the numerical value in the value display portion" citing to column 2, lines 15-20, also "This value corresponds to the value currently indicated by a slider pointer relative to the extreme values of the ranges," and also "it would have been obvious... to include displaying the current date corresponding to the location within the range of dates...." Applicant respectfully submits that this fails to present a *prima facie* obviousness rejection of Claim 16, which recites "*generating a center mark on the media handle that indicates the period of time that is browsed to the centerline of the view of the computer program product*." The Office Action refers to a slider pointer. However, this feature is disclosed in the Rzepkowski patent neither as a center mark of a media handle nor indicating a period of time browsed to at the centerline of a view. Instead the numerical value and slider pointer both relate to an absolute current position of a selected value over a range of available values. Nothing in the Rzepkowski patent teaches or suggests generating a *center mark on a media handle that indicates a period of time that is browsed to at the centerline of a view*." Thus, Applicant submits that the rejection of Claim 16 is traversed and that Claim 16 is patentable for this additional reason, in addition to the remarks and amendments described above with respect to the patentability of independent Claim 1.

Further with respect to Claim 31 and similar dependent Claims 36 and 41 that are rejected as unpatentable over the Rothmuller patent in view of the Wynn patent and the Becker patent and further in

view of the Ullmann patent, Applicant submits that nothing in any of the Rothmuller publication, the Wynn patent, the Becker patent, or the Ullmann patent discloses "automatically returning the media handle to a rest position corresponding to the centerline position when the media handle is released." Applicant notes that the Ullmann patent only discloses, as stated on page 12 of the Office Action, "De-selection of the control, such as by releasing a mouse button, causes the rubber band display to be removed, and operation of the GUI control is ceased." However, the Ullmann patent fails to teach or suggest automatically returning the GUI control to a rest position corresponding to a centerline position of the time bar when the GUI control is released. FIG. 4e shows use of the rubber band on a virtual joystick, but nothing is shown or described that teaches or suggests automatically returning the virtual joystick to a rest position corresponding to a centerline position of a time bar when the virtual joystick is released. Applicant submits that Claim 31 and similar dependent Claims 36 and 41 are patentable for this additional reason.

Accordingly, for the reasons presented above, Applicant submits that rejections of the Office Action are overcome by the present amendments to the claims and that all of Claims 1, 3-5, 7-25, 27, and 29-41 are patentable and in condition for allowance

#### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing comments, Applicant submits that all of the pending claims of the present application, as amended, are in condition for allowance. It is therefore respectfully requested that a Notice of Allowance be issued. The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney to resolve any remaining issues in order to expedite examination of the present invention.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper, such as fees for a request for an extension of time. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Appl No.: 10/715,095

Amdt. Dated: August 6, 2008

Reply to Office Action dated May 8, 2008

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher J. Gegg

Registration No. 50,857

Telephone No. 704-444-1024

**CUSTOMER NO. 00826**

**ALSTON & BIRD LLP**

Bank of America Plaza

101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000

Charlotte, NC 28280-4000

Tel Charlotte Office (704) 444-1000

Fax Charlotte Office (704) 444-1111

LEGAL02/30891160v1

**ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF  
THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON AUGUST 6, 2008.**